Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/062,541	TERADA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
•	Denise Tran	2186
All Participants: Status of Application: amendment after first action		
(1) <u>Denise Tran (examiner)</u> .	(3)	
(2) Raymond Mah (Reg. No. 41,426).	(4)	
Date of Interview: 31 March 2004	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:		
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: a proposed 112 fist		
Claims discussed: 22, 34-35, and 37-42		
Prior art documents discussed: Berra et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,278,759		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet		
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate r directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate r did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary 	e examiner will provide a writte ecord of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
Neusepan		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant	Applicant's Representative Signature	nature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The applicant's representative, Mr. Raymond said that page 42, line 19 to page 43, line 9 and page 54, lines 14-20 of the specification providing the support for the claimed feature '... the new comunication being higher than a communication speed ..." claim 34; and the examiner suggest a proposed amendment to includde the alowable subject matter of claim 22 in to claims 34-35 and 39-40 and to avoid the proposed 112 first rejection; however, the applicant's representative disagreed.

Henrym